Appln. No. 10/624,857
Amendment dated September 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed June 4, 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 25 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. Claims 26 through 29 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burstein and DRM (www.reed-electronics.com/semiconductor/article/CA231640. (Although it is not entirely clear from the rejection, it appears that the DRM document is the primary reference of the obviousness rejection.)

Initially, it is noted that claims 23 through 25, which were added by the previous response, were not addressed in the rejection or remarks of the pending Office Action and therefore do not currently stand rejected.

Claim 1 requires "receiving a diagnostic code for a component of a computer system" and "generating an authentication code *associated with* the diagnostic code" (emphasis added).

It is conceded in the rejection of the Office Action that the DRM document does not disclose this requirement of the claims, but it is then asserted that:

> Burnstein teaches "generating an authentication code (column 10, line 24 to column1 1, line 26, i.e., authentication such as by using start screen and domain manager) associated with the diagnostic code (column 14, line 61 to column 15, line 67; figure 4; claims 15,16 of Burnstein I.e. diagnostic tools used after authentication permits the use of diagnostic tools)" for the motivation of permitting an agent to register and manage a plurality of domain names for a plurality of different registrants (column 3, lines 5-60) thereby including the use of diagnostics (for management) upon proper authentication (such as would be necessary for an agent).

Page 6 of 11

PAGE 8/13 * RCVD AT 9/4/2007 12:09:30 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/16 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:605 339 3357 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-16

Appln. No. 10/624,857
Amendment dated September 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed June 4, 2007

And it is further asserted that:

     Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Burnstein and DRM for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Turning to the referenced portion of the Burstein patent, it is stated at col. 10, line 24 through col. 11, line 26 that (emphasis added):

     Having described the overall structure, this discussion now turns to illustrations of how particularly useful functions are implemented in a preferred aspect of the present invention. Referring to FIG. 2, a start screen generated by the front-end domain manager is illustrated. In this illustrative implementation, it is assumed that the operator accessing the domain manager is acting as an agent for a domain name registrant to modify some information about the domain name or perform another domain management function. Such a start screen preferably requests identification and authentication information *from the operator* to ensure that *the agent is authorized* to use the domain manager and to make changes for that domain. The authentication information is collected by the front-end of the domain manager and passed to the back-end domain server for confirmation. Once logged in or otherwise authenticated through a screen like that illustrated in FIG. 2, a screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 3 appears to prompt for the domain name to be modified or managed by the operator. All communications following the authentication screen are preferably encrypted between the front-end server and the back-end server. The operator enters the domain name to be active for the initial portion of the session and sends the message to the front-end server. The operator sends the name to the front-end domain manager server, which accesses information about the domain name from the back-end server and returns a function select screen.

     Information is gathered about the domain name by the back-end server and passed to the front-end server. The front-end domain manager server sends a screen that allows the operator to select the management functionality to be executed. For example, the front-end domain manager may cause display of a screen like that illustrated in FIG. 4. Most preferably, the returned function screen illustrates all of the functions that can be performed on that domain name by that operator. It should be appreciated that certain functionality is accessible only to the original or authorized registrar for a domain name and so certain registrant agents may be unable to perform certain maintenance or management functions. When the agent initially registered the domain name for the registrant through the domain manager, *the agent is preferably automatically recognized as authoritative* for that domain name. An agent is also preferably recognized as authoritative when the agent has previously accessed the domain manager and received authentication for that particular domain name.

     For agents not already recognized as authoritative, further authentication is preferably requested. Operators that are technical contacts or domain name administrators may enter a domain name to be managed and the front-end domain manager issues a screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 5 to request further authentication. As shown in this example, the screen generated by the front-end domain manager might inform the operator not already recognized as authoritative that the operator is asking to be recognized as the authoritative zone and technical contact of the indicated domain name. The screen of FIG. 5 indicates that

Page 7 of 11

Appln. No. 10/624,857
Amendment dated September 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed June 4, 2007

authorization for the operator's request must be confirmed from the administrative contact for the domain name. The operator clicks on the appropriate button to indicate that the indicated action is desired. The front-end of the domain manager sends a command to the back-end domain manager, which sends an e-mail to the administrative contact for the domain name and waits for confirmation from the administrative contact that authorization is proper. Upon authorization, the back-end domain manager recognizes the operator as the authoritative zone and technical contact for that domain name and sends an appropriate message through the front-end domain manager to the operator.

It is submitted that the Burstein patent does not disclose, either here or elsewhere in the patent, the "generat[ion of] an authentication code [that is] *associated with* the diagnostic code" as required by claim 1. Instead, the Burstein patent discusses the authorization of an "agent", and thus it is the agent that is authorized and not any element or item, such as, for example, any diagnostic code. It is also not evident from the discussion in the Burstein patent that any authentication code is generated, as it is unclear as to how the agent provides "authentication information" to the Burstein system. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that it is the operator/agent that provides the authentication information, and that the information is not generated.

In connection with this, it should be noted that claim 25 requires that "a user is incapable of generating the authentication code". Also, claim 26 requires that "the authenticating code is generated without user intervention" as discussed in the present specification at page 7, lines 14 et seq., claim 27 requires that "the authentication code is generated by the computer system", and claim 24 that "the authentication code generated is unique to the diagnostic code received".

It also is not apparent from the Burstein patent what is the origin of the authentication information, but appears to be the agent, and thus this is contrary to the requirements of claim 23 that "the generating of the authentication code is performed after the receiving of the diagnostic code", the requirement of claim 28 of "requesting an authentication code by the computer system after receiving the diagnostic code" and of claim 29 that

Page 8 of 11

"generating the authentication code is performed in response to receiving the diagnostic code".

The rejection further cites the Burstein patent at col. 14, line 61 through col. 15, line 67 that:

Particularly preferred embodiments of a domain manager in accordance with the present invention provide a set of diagnostic tools for evaluating the state and working condition of a registrant's domain. An exemplary set of diagnostic functions is illustrated on the upper line of the function select screen of FIG. 4, including ping, Whois, host, dig and SRS. Selecting one of these functions runs the diagnostic function on the active domain name. The back-end domain manager runs the diagnostic function and returns the results in the form of response screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 11. FIG. 11 shows the results of the host function, which accesses the SRS and lists out the IP address for the host domain name and the aliases associated with that same IP address. The host utility also returns information about the mail exchange servers for the host domain name. Further discussion of the diagnostic functions is now set forth.

The ping utility is used to determine whether or not an address at a certain domain name is active or responding. When the ping utility is selected, the domain manager sends a packet of information to the domain name being diagnosed and waits for a response. If the target domain is active and operating properly, the domain server returns a message including the IP address to which the domain name resolves. Most preferably, the ping utility also returns the time required for the packet to make the round trip from the back-end domain manager to the target domain and a response to return to the back-end domain manager.

The Whois utility causes the domain manager to issue a Whois query. A Whois database is a database maintained by a registrar that contains information about the domain names registered through the registrar. The information within the Whois database might include the registering organization (i.e., the registrant) and various contact information for the technical, zone and administrative contacts for the domain. Consequently, the Whois utility causes the domain manager to issue a Whois query. The Whois database for the target domain returns the identity of the registrant and the contact information related to the domain name. Different Whois databases will return different sets of information due to the non-standard definition of Whois databases.

The host utility causes the back-end domain manager to make a host inquiry of the domain name, which returns the information illustrated in FIG. 10. This utility can be used to ensure that the IP address for a site has properly propagated through the network of domain name servers. In this regard, the domain manager executing the host utility queries a plurality of different name servers, for example three name servers, to determine if all of the name servers resolve the same IP address for the target domain name. A positive result from the host query indicates that the domain name has propagated well through the name server network.

Other diagnostic functions are preferably provided by the domain manager to operators to efficiently act as agents in managing a registrant's domain include the dig and SRS utilities. The dig utility queries one of the thirteen root servers to find the name server

that is authoritative for a specific domain name. A dig can be used to determine whether the information for a domain name has been updated on the root server level by the shared registry system or the registry responsible for each country code top-level domain. The SRS utility causes the back-end domain manager to search the shared registry system to determine if a domain name is registered, when it was registered, when it was last modified and what name servers are authoritative for the domain name.

For most of these diagnostic utilities, the back-end domain manager can execute the utility regardless of the authoritative name server for the domain name. This is different for the SRS utility, where the domain name server can only execute SRS queries for domains within the .com, .net and .org top-level domains and for domains that use front-end servers associated with the back-end server that are defined as the authoritative domain name servers.

It is submitted that while this portion of the Burstein patent may discuss various utilities of the Burstein system, it does not disclose the origin of the authentication information or that the authentication information is associated with a diagnostic code, as opposed to an agent as previously noted, or that any authenticating code is generated in response to the reception of a diagnostic code and is associated with that diagnostic code or is unique to that code.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Burnstein and the DRM document set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 9 and 15. Further, claims 2 through 8 and 23 through 29, which depend from claim 1, claims 10 through 14, which depend from claim 9, and claims 16 through 22, which depend from claim 15 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/624,857
Amendment dated September 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed June 4, 2007

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

_____   Date: SEPTEMBER 4, 2007
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357